arXiv:1608.03224v1 [math.GR] 10 Aug 2016

# On weakly $\sigma$-permutable subgroups of finite groups*

Chi Zhang, Zhenfeng Wu, W. Guo†

Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China

Hefei, 230026, P.R. China

E-mail:zcqxj32@mail.ustc.edu.cn, zhfwu@mail.ustc.edu.cn, wbguo@ustc.edu.cn

**Abstract**

Let $G$ be a finite group and $\sigma = \{\sigma_i | i \in I\}$ be a partition of the set of all primes $\mathbb{P}$. A set $\mathcal{H}$ of subgroups of $G$ with $1 \in \mathcal{H}$ is said to be a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ if every non-identity member of $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G$. A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be $\sigma$-permutable if $G$ possesses a complete Hall $\sigma$-set $\mathcal{H}$ such that $HA^x = A^xH$ for all $A \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $x \in G$. We say that a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ if there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G}$, where $H_{\sigma G}$ is the subgroup of $H$ generated by all those subgroups of $H$ which are $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. By using this new notion, we establish some new criterias for a group $G$ to be a $\sigma$-soluble and supersoluble, and also we give the conditions under which a normal subgroup of $G$ is hypercyclically embedded.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all groups are finite and $G$ always denotes a group. Moreover, $n$ is an integer, $\mathbb{P}$ is the set of all primes. The symbol $\pi(n)$ denotes the set of all primes dividing $n$ and $\pi(G) = \pi(|G|)$, the set of all primes dividing the order of $G$. $|G|_p$ denotes the order of the Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$.

In what follows, $\sigma = \{\sigma_i | i \in I\}$ is some partition of $\mathbb{P}$, that is, $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \sigma_i$ and $\sigma_i \cap \sigma_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. $\Pi$ is always supposed to be a non-empty subset of $\sigma$ and $\Pi' = \sigma \backslash \Pi$. We write $\sigma(n) = \{\sigma_i | \sigma_i \cap \pi(n) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\sigma(G) = \sigma(|G|)$.

*Research was supported by the NNSF of China (11371335) and Wu Wen-Tsun Key Laboratory of Mathematics of Chinese Academy of Sciences.

†Corresponding author

Keywords: Finite group; $\sigma$-permutable subgroup; weakly $\sigma$-permutable subgroup; $\sigma$-soluble; supersoluble; hypercyclically embedded

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 20D10, 20D15, 20D20

Following [1,2], $G$ is said to be $\sigma$-primary if $G = 1$ or $|\sigma(G)| = 1$; $n$ is said to be a $\Pi$-number if $\pi(n) \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma_i \in \Pi} \sigma_i$; a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is called a $\Pi$-subgroup of $G$ if $|H|$ is a $\Pi$-number; a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is called a Hall $\Pi$-subgroup of $G$ if $H$ is a $\Pi$-subgroup of $G$ and $|G : H|$ is a $\Pi'$-number. A set $\mathcal{H}$ of subgroups of $G$ with $1 \in \mathcal{H}$ is said to be a complete Hall $\Pi$-set of $G$ if every non-identity member of $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G$ for some $\sigma_i \in \Pi$ and $\mathcal{H}$ contains exact one Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G$ for every $\sigma_i \in \Pi \cap \sigma(G)$. In particular, when $\Pi = \sigma$, we call $\mathcal{H}$ a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$. $G$ is said to be $\Pi$-*full* if $G$ possesses a complete Hall $\Pi$-set; *a* $\Pi$-*full group of Sylow type* if every subgroup of $G$ is a $D_{\sigma_i}$-group for all $\sigma_i \in \Pi \cap \sigma(G)$. In particular, $G$ is said to be $\sigma$-*full* (or $\sigma$-*group*) if $G$ possesses a complete Hall $\sigma$-set; *a* $\sigma$-*full group of Sylow type* if every subgroup of $G$ is a $D_{\sigma_i}$-group for all $\sigma_i \in \sigma(G)$. A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is called [1] $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$ if there is a subgroup chain $H = H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \cdots \leq H_t = G$ such that either $H_{i-1}$ is normal in $H_i$ or $H_i/(H_{i-1})_{H_i}$ is $\sigma$-primary for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, t$.

In the past 20 years, a large number of researches have involved finding and applying some generalized complemented subgroups. For example, a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be $c$-normal [3] in $G$ if $G$ has a normal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_G$, where $H_G$ is the normal core of $H$. A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be weakly $s$-permutable [4] in $G$ if $G$ has a subnormal subgroup $T$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{sG}$, where $H_{sG}$ is the largest $s$-permutable subgroup of $G$ contained in $H$ (note that a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be $s$-permutable in $G$ if $HP = PH$ for any Sylow subgroup $P$ of $G$). A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be $\sigma$-permutable [1] in $G$ if $G$ possesses a complete Hall $\sigma$-set $\mathcal{H}$ such that $HA^x = A^xH$ for all $A \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $x \in G$. By using the above special supplemented subgroups and other generalized complemented subgroups, people have obtained a series of interesting results (see [1,3–11] and so on). Now, we consider the following new generalized supplemented subgroup:

**Definition 1.1.** A subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ if there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G}$, where $H_{\sigma G}$ is the subgroup of $H$ generated by all those subgroups of $H$ which are $\sigma$-permutable in $G$.

Following [12], $H_{\sigma G}$ is called $\sigma$-core of $H$.

It is clear that every $c$-normal subgroup, every $s$-permutable subgroup, every weakly $s$-permutable subgroup and every $\sigma$-permutable subgroup of $G$ are all weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. However, the following example shows that the converse is not true.

**Example 1.2.** Let $G = (C_7 \rtimes C_3) \times A_5$, where $C_7 \rtimes C_3$ is a non-abelian group of order 21 and $A_5$ is the alternating group of degree 5. Let $B$ be a subgroup of $A_5$ of order 12 and $A$ be a Sylow 5-subgroup of $A_5$. Let $\sigma = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$, where $\sigma_1 = \{2, 3, 5\}$ and $\sigma_2 = \{2, 3, 5\}'$. Then $B$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. In fact, let $T = (C_7 \rtimes C_3) \times A$, then $C_7 \rtimes C_3 \leq T_G$ and

$|G : C_7 \rtimes C_3| = 5 \cdot 2^2 \cdot 3$ is a $\sigma_1$-number. Hence $G/T_G$ is a $\sigma_1$-group, and so $T$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$. Since $T \cap B = 1$ and $G = BT$, which means that $B$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. But $B$ is neither weakly $s$-permutable in $G$ nor $c$-normal in $G$. In fact, if there exists a subnormal subgroup $K$ of $G$ such that $G = BK$ and $B \cap K \leq B_{sG}$. Then $B_{sG}$ is subnormal in $G$ by [4, Lemma 2.8], and so is subnormal in $A_5$ by [13, A, (14.1)] . It follows that $B_{sG} = 1$ for $A_5$ is a simple group. Hence $|G : K| = |B| = 2^2 \cdot 3$. But since $1 < A_5 < A_5C_7 < G$ is a chief series of $G$ and also a composition series of $G$, $G$ has no subnormal subgroup $K$ whose index is $2^2 \cdot 3$ by Jordan-Hölder theorem. Therefore $B$ is not weakly $s$-permutable in $G$. Consequently, $B$ is neither $s$-permutable nor $c$-normal in $G$.

Now let $H = BC_3$. Then $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ but not $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, Indeed, let $T = C_7A_5$. Then $G = HT$, $T$ is normal in $G$ and $H \cap T = B$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{H} = \{A_5C_3, C_7\}$ is a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$. Since $H_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.3 (4) below and [1, Theorem B], $H_{\sigma G} \leq O_{\sigma_1}(G)$ by Lemma 2.2(8) below. Clearly, $O_{\sigma_1}(G) \leq C_G(O_{\sigma_2}(G)) = C_G(C_7) = C_7A_5$. Hence $H_{\sigma G} \leq C_7A_5$. But since $B(A_5C_3)^x = BA_5C_3^x = A_5C_3^x = C_3^xA_5 = (A_5C_3)^xB$ for all $x \in G$, $B$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ for $C_7 \trianglelefteq G$. Hence $B \leq H_{\sigma G} \leq C_7A_5$, which implies that $B = H_{\sigma G}$. So $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, But $H$ is not $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ for $H_{\sigma G} = B < H$.

Following [1], $G$ is called: (i) $\sigma$-soluble if every chief factor of $G$ is $\sigma$-primary; (ii) $\sigma$-nilpotent if $H/K \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K))$ is $\sigma$-primary for every chief factor $H/K$ of $G$.

The result in [1, 3, 4, 14, 15] are the motivation for the following:

**Question 1.3.** Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type. What is the structure of $G$ provided that some subgroups are weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$?

In this paper, we obtain the following results.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and every Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ for every $\sigma_i \in \sigma(G)$. Then $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble.*

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $\mathcal{H} = \{1, W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_t\}$ be a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ such that $W_i$ is a nilpotent $\sigma_i$-subgroup for all $i = 1, \cdots, t$. Suppose that the maximal subgroups of any non-cyclic $W_i$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. Then $G$ is supersoluble.*

The following results now follow immediately from Theorems 1.4 and 1.5.

**Corollary 1.6.** If every sylow subgroup is weakly $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is soluble.

**Corollary 1.7.** (See Huppert [16, Chap. VI, Theorem 10.3]) If every Sylow subgroup of $G$ is cyclic, then $G$ is supersoluble .

**Corollary 1.8.** (See Miao [17, Corollary 3.4]) If all maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of $G$ are weakly $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

**Corollary 1.9.** (See Skiba [4, Theorem 1.4]) If all maximal subgroups of every non-cyclic Sylow subgroup of $G$ are weakly $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

**Corollary 1.10.** (See Srinivasan [15, Theorem 1]) If all maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of $G$ are normal in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

**Corollary 1.11.** (See Srinivasan [15, Theorem 2]) If all maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of $G$ are $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

**Corollary 1.12.** (See Wang [3, Theorem 4.1]) If all maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of $G$ are $c$-normal in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

Recall that a normal subgroup $E$ of $G$ is called hypercyclically embedded in $G$ and is denoted by $E \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$ (see [18, p. 217]) if either $E = 1$ or $E \neq 1$ and every chief factor of $G$ below $E$ is cyclic, where the symbol $Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$ is the $\mathfrak{U}$-hypercentre of $G$, that is, the product of all normal hypercyclically embedded subgroups of $G$. Hypercyclically embedded subgroups play an important role in the theory of groups (see [7, 8, 18, 19] ) and the conditions under which a normal subgroup is hypercyclically embedded in $G$ were found by many authors (see the books [7, 8, 18, 19] and the recent papers [10, 14, 20–23] ).

On the base of Theorem 1.5, we will prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.13.** *Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $\mathcal{H} = \{1, W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_t\}$ be a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ such that $W_i$ is nilpotent for all $i = 1, \cdots, t$. Let $E$ be a normal subgroup of $G$. If every maximal subgroup of $W_i \cap E$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, t$, then $E \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$.*

The following results directly follow from Theorem 1.13.

**Corollary 1.14.** Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersoluble groups and let $E$ be a normal subgroup of $G$ with $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. Suppose that $G$ is a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $\mathcal{H} = \{1, W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_t\}$ is a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ such that $W_i$ is nilpotent for all $i = 1, \cdots, t$. If every maximal subgroup of $W_i \cap E$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, t$, then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.

**Corollary 1.15.** (See Asaad [24, Theorem 4.1]) Let $G$ be a group with a normal subgroup $E$ such that $G/E$ is supersoluble. If every maximal subgroup of every Sylow subgroups of $E$ is $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is supersoluble.

**Corollary 1.16.** (See Asaad [25, Theorem 1.3]) Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersoluble groups and let $E$ be a normal subgroup of $G$ with $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. If the maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of E are $s$-permutable in $G$, then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.

**Corollary 1.17.** (See Wei [11, Corollary 1]) Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersoluble groups and let $E$ be a normal subgroup of $G$ with $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. If the maximal subgroups of every Sylow subgroup of E are $c$-normal in $G$, then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.

All unexplained terminologies and notations are standard, as in [8] and [13].

# 2 Preliminaries

We use $\mathfrak{S}_\sigma$ and $\mathfrak{N}_\sigma$ to denote the classes of all $\sigma$-soluble groups and $\sigma$-nilpotent groups.

**Lemma 2.1.** (See [1, Lemma 2.1] The class $\mathfrak{S}_\sigma$ is closed under taking direct products, homomorphic images and subgroups. Moreover, any extension of the $\sigma$-soluble group by a $\sigma$-soluble group is a $\sigma$-soluble group as well.

Following [1] and [2], $O^{\Pi}(G)$ to denote the subgroup of $G$ generated by all its $\Pi'$-subgroups. Instead of $O^{\{\sigma_i\}}(G)$ we write $O^{\sigma_i}(G)$. $O_{\Pi}(G)$ to denote the subgroup of $G$ generated by all its normal $\Pi$-subgroups.

**Lemma 2.2.** (See [1, Lemma 2.6] and [2, Lemma 2.1]) Let $A, K$ and $N$ be subgroups of $G$. Suppose that $A$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$ and $N$ is normal in $G$.

(1) $A \cap K$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $K$.
(2) If $K$ is a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup of $A$, then $K$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$.
(3) If $K$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$, then $A \cap K$ and $\langle A, K\rangle$ are $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$.
(4) $AN/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$.
(5) If $N \leq K$ and $K/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$, then $K$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$.
(6) If $K \leq A$ and $A$ is $\sigma$-nilpotent, then $K$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$.
(7) If $|G : A|$ is a $\Pi$-number, then $O^{\Pi}(A) = O^{\Pi}(G)$.
(8) If $G$ is $\Pi$-full and $A$ is a $\Pi$-group, then $A \leq O_{\Pi}(G)$.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be some non-empty set of subgroups of $G$ and $E$ a subgroup of $G$. Then a subgroup $A$ of $G$ is called $\mathcal{L}$-permutable if $AH = HA$ for all $H \in \mathcal{L}$; $\mathcal{L}^E$-permutable if $AH^x = H^xA$ for all $H \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $x \in E$. In particular, a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is $\sigma$-permutable if $G$ possesses a complete Hall $\sigma$-set $\mathcal{H}$ such that $H$ is $\mathcal{H}^G$-permutable.

**Lemma 2.3.** (See [1, Lemma 2.8] and [2, Lemma 2.2]) Let $H, K$ and $N$ be subgroups of $G$. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \cdots, H_t\}$ be a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{H}^K$. Suppose that $H$ is $\mathcal{L}$-permutable and $N$ is normal in $G$.

(1) If $H \leq E \leq G$, then $H$ is $\mathcal{L}^*$-permutable, where $\mathcal{L}^* = \{H_1 \cap E, H_2 \cap E, \cdots, H_t \cap E\}^{K \cap E}$. In particular, if $G$ is a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $H$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, then $H$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $E$.

(2) The subgroup $HN/N$ is $\mathcal{L}^{**}$-permutable, where $\mathcal{L}^{**} = \{H_1N/N, \cdots, H_tN/N\}^{KN/N}$.

(3) If $G$ is a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $E/N$ is a $\sigma$-permutable subgroup of $G/N$, then $E$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$.

(4) If $K$ is $\mathcal{L}$-permutable, then $\langle H, K\rangle$ is $\mathcal{L}$-permutable [13, A, Lemma 1.6(a)]. In particular, $H_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$. Moreover, if $G$ is a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type, then $H_{\sigma G}$ is a $\sigma$-subnormal of $G$(see [1, Theorems B and C]).

**Lemma 2.4.** (See [1, Lemma 3.1]) Let $H$ be a $\sigma_1$-subgroup of a $\sigma$-full group $G$. Then $H$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ if and only if $O^{\sigma_1}(G) \leq N_G(H)$.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $H \leq K \leq G$.

(1) If $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, then $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $K$.

(2) Suppose that $N$ is a normal subgroup of $G$ and $N \leq H$. Then $H/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$ if and only if $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$.

(3) If $N$ is a normal subgroup of $G$, then for every weakly $\sigma$-permutable subgroup $H$ of $G$ with $(|H|, |N|) = 1$, $HN/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$.

*Proof.* (1) Suppose that there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G}$. Since $H \leq K$, $K = H(K \cap T)$. By Lemma 2.2 (1), $K \cap T$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $K$. Moreover, $H \cap (K \cap T) = H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G} \leq H_{\sigma K}$ by Lemma 2.3 (1)(4). Hence, $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $K$.

(2) First assume that there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G}$. Then $G/N = (H/N)(TN/N)$, $TN/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$ by Lemma 2.2 (4) and $H/N \cap TN/N = (H \cap T)N/N \leq H_{\sigma G}N/N \leq (H/N)_{\sigma(G/N)}$ by Lemma 2.3 (2). This shows that $H/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$.

Conversely, assume that $H/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$. Then $G/N = (H/N)(T/N)$ and $H/N \cap T/N \leq (H/N)_{\sigma(G/N)}$, where $T/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$. So $G = HT$ and $T$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.2 (5). Let $(H/N)_{\sigma(G/N)} = E/N$. Then $E$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ by Lemma 2.3 (3)(4). Hence $H \cap T \leq E \leq H_{\sigma G}$. This shows that $H$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$.

(3) Assume that there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_{\sigma G}$. Then $G/N = (HN/N)(TN/N)$. Since $(|H|, |N|) = 1$, $(|HT \cap N : H \cap N|, |HT \cap N : T \cap N|) = (|(HT \cap N)H : H|, |(HT \cap N)T : T|) = 1$. Hence $N = N \cap HT = (N \cap H)(N \cap T) = N \cap T$ by [13, A, Lemma 1.6]. It follows that $N \leq T$. Hence $(HN/N) \cap (TN/N) = (H \cap T)N/N \leq H_{\sigma G}N/N \leq (HN/N)_{\sigma(G/N)}$ by Lemma 2.3 (2)(4).

Besides, by Lemma 2.2 (4), $T/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$. Thus $HN/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$. □

**Lemma 2.6.** (See [26, Lemma 2.12]) Let $P$ be a normal $p$-subgroup of a group $G$ . If $P/\Phi(P) \leq Z_{\mathcal{U}}(G/\Phi(P))$, then $P \leq Z_{\mathcal{U}}(G)$.

# 3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Assume that this is false and let $G$ be a counterexample of minimal order. Then $|\sigma(G)| > 1$.

(1) $G/N$ is $\sigma$-soluble, for every non-identity normal subgroup $N$ of $G$.

Let $N$ be a non-identity normal subgroup of $G$ and $H/N$ is any Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G/N$, where $\sigma_i \cap \pi(G/N) \neq \emptyset$. Then $H/N = H_iN/N$ for some Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup $H_i$ of $G$. By the hypothesis, there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = H_iT$ and $H_i \cap T \leq (H_i)_{\sigma G}$. Then $G/N = (H_iN/N)(TN/N) = (H/N)(TN/N)$. Since $|H_iN \cap T : H_i \cap T| = |(H_iN \cap T)H_i : H_i|$ is a $\sigma_i'$-number, $(|H_iN \cap T : H_i \cap T|, |H_iN \cap T : N \cap T|) = 1$. Hence $H_iN \cap T = (H_i \cap T)(N \cap T)$ by [13, A, Lemma 1.6]. Consequently, $(H_iN/N) \cap (TN/N) = (H_iN \cap T)N/N = (H_i \cap T)N/N \leq (H_i)_{\sigma G}N/N \leq (H_iN/N)_{\sigma(G/N)}$ by Lemma 2.3 (2)(4). By Lemma 2.2 (4), $TN/N$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G/N$. Therefore $H/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$. This shows that $G/N$ satisfies the hypothesis. The minimal choice of $G$ implies that $G/N$ is $\sigma$-soluble.

(2) $G$ is not a simple group.

Suppose that $G$ is a non-abelian simple group. Then 1 is the only proper $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup of $G$. Let $H_i$ be a non-identity Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $G$, where $\sigma_i \in \sigma(G)$. By the hypothesis and $|\sigma(G)| > 1$, we have $G = H_iG$ and $H_i = H_i \cap G \leq (H_i)_{\sigma G}$. By Lemma 2.3 (4), $(H_i)_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$, so $H_i = (H_i)_{\sigma G} = 1$, a contradiction. So we have (2).

(3) Let $R$ be a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, then $R$ is $\sigma$-soluble.

Let $H$ be any Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup of $R$, where $\sigma_i \cap \pi(R) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists a Hall $\sigma_i$-subgroup $H_i$ of $G$ such that $H = H_i \cap R$. By the hypothesis, there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = H_iT$ and $H_i \cap T \leq (H_i)_{\sigma G}$. Since $|H_iT \cap R : H_i \cap R| = |(H_iT \cap R)H_i : H_i|$ is a $\sigma_i'$-number, $(|H_iT \cap R : H_i \cap R|, |H_iT \cap R : T \cap R|) = 1$. Hence, $R = R \cap H_iT = (H_i \cap R)(R \cap T) = H(R \cap T)$ by [13, A, Lemma 1.6(c)]. Since $R \cap T$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $R$ by Lemma 2.2 (1) and $H \cap R \cap T = (R \cap H_i) \cap (R \cap T) \leq (H_i)_{\sigma G} \cap R \leq (H)_{\sigma R}$ by Lemma 2.3 (1)(4), $R$ satisfies the hypothesis. The minimal choice of $G$ implies that $R$ is $\sigma$-soluble.

(4) Final contradiction.

In veiw of (1), (2) and (3), we have that $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble by Lemma 2.1. The final contra-

diction completes the proof of the theorem.

# 4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

First we prove the following proposition, which is a main step of the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $G$ be a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type and $\mathcal{H} = \{1, W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_t\}$ be a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G$ such that $W_i$ is a nilpotent $\sigma_i$-subgroup for all $i = 1, \cdots, t$, and let the smallest prime $p$ of $\pi(G)$ belongs to $\sigma_1$. If every maximal subgroup of $W_1$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, then $G$ is soluble.

*Proof.* First note that if $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble, then every chief factor $H/K$ of $G$ is $\sigma$-primary, that is, $H/K$ is a $\sigma_i$-group for some $i$. But since $W_i$ is nilpotent, $H/K$ is a elementary abelian group. It follows that $G$ is soluble. Hence we only need to prove that $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble. Suppose that the assertion is false, and let $G$ be a counterexample of minimal order. Then clearly $t > 1$, and $p = 2 \in \pi(W_1)$ by the well-known Feit-Thompson's theorem. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $W_i$ is a $\sigma_i$-group for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, t$.

(1) $O_{\sigma_1}(G) = 1$.

Assume that $N = O_{\sigma_1}(G) \neq 1$. Note that if $W_1 = N$, then $G/N$ is a $\sigma_1'$-group, so $G/N$ is soluble by the well-known Feit-Thompson's theorem and so $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble. We may, therefore, assume that $W_1 \neq N$. Then $W_1/N$ is a non-identity Hall $\sigma_1$-subgroup of $G/N$. Let $M/N$ be a maximal subgroup of $W_1/N$. Then $M$ is a maximal subgroup of $W_1$. By the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (2), $M/N$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/N$. The minimal choice of $G$ implies that $G/N$ is $\sigma$-soluble. Consequently, $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble. This contradiction shows that (1) holds.

(2) $O_{\sigma_1'}(G) = 1$.

Assume that $R = O_{\sigma_1'}(G) \neq 1$. Then $W_1R/R$ is a Hall $\sigma_1$-subgroup of $G/R$. Let $M/R$ be a maximal subgroup of $W_1R/R$. Then $M = (M \cap W_1)R$. Since $W_1$ is nilpotent and $|W_1R/R : M/R| = |W_1R/R : (M \cap W_1)R/R| = |W_1 : M \cap W_1|$, $M \cap W_1$ is a maximal subgroup of $W_1$. By the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (3), $M/R = (M \cap W_1)R/R$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/R$. This shows that $G/R$ satisfies the hypothesis. The choice of $G$ implies that $G/R$ is $\sigma$-soluble. By the well-known Feit-Thompson's theorem, we know that $R$ is soluble. It follows that $G$ is $\sigma$-soluble, a contradiction.

(3) If $R \neq 1$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, then $R$ is not $\sigma$-soluble and $G = RW_1$.

If $R$ is $\sigma$-soluble, then $R$ is a $\sigma_i$-group for some $\sigma_i \in \sigma(G)$. So $R \leq O_{\sigma_1}(G)$ or $R \leq O_{\sigma_1'}(G)$, a contradiction. Therefore, $R$ is not $\sigma$-soluble. Assume that $RW_1 < G$. Then by the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (1), $RW_1$ satisfies the hypothesis. Hence $RW_1$ is $\sigma$-soluble by the choice of $G$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $R$ is $\sigma$-soluble. This contradiction shows that $G = RW_1$.

(4) $G$ has a unique minimal normal subgroup $R$.

By (3), $G = RW_1$ for every non-identity minimal normal subgroup $R$ of $G$. Then clearly, $G/R$ is $\sigma$-soluble. Hence by Lemma 2.1 $G$ has a unique minimal normal subgroup, which is denoted by $R$.

(5) $W_1$ is a 2-group.

Let $q \in \pi(W_1)\backslash\{2\}$. As $W_1$ is nilpotent, there exists two maximal subgroups $M_1$ and $M_2$ of $W_1$ such that $|W_1 : M_1| = q$ and $|W_1 : M_2| = 2$. By the hypothesis, there exists $\sigma$-subnormal subgroups $T_i$ of $G$, such that $G = M_iT_i$ and $M_i \cap T_i \leq (M_i)_{\sigma G}$, $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 2.3 (4), $(M_i)_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$. Then by Lemma 2.2 (8), $(M_i)_{\sigma G} \leq O_{\sigma_1}(G) = 1$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence $M_i \cap T_i = 1, i = 1, 2$. Consequently, $|G : T_i| = |M_i : M_i \cap T_i| = |M_i|$, $i = 1, 2$, which implies that $|G : T_i|$ is a $\sigma_1$-number for $i = 1, 2$. Hence $O^{\sigma_1}(T_i) = O^{\sigma_1}(G)$ for $i = 1, 2$ by Lemma 2.2 (7). Since $t > 1$, $O^{\sigma_1}(G) > 1$. It follows that $1 \neq O^{\sigma_1}(G) \leq (T_i)_G$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then by (4), $R \leq (T_1)_G \cap (T_2)_G \leq T_1 \cap T_2$. It is clear that $W_1 \cap R$ is a Hall $\sigma_1$-subgroup of $R$, and $W_1 \cap R \neq 1$ by (2). So $1 \neq W_1 \cap R \leq T_1 \cap T_2 \cap W_1$. Since $G = M_1T_1 = W_1T_1 = M_2T_2 = W_1T_2$, where $M_1 \cap T_1 = 1$ and $M_2 \cap T_2 = 1$, we have that $|W_1 \cap T_1| = |W_1 : M_1| = q$ and $|W_1 \cap T_2| = |W_1 : M_2| = 2$. Therefore $(W_1 \cap T_1) \cap (W_1 \cap T_2) = 1$, which implies that $1 \neq W_1 \cap R \leq T_1 \cap T_2 \cap W_1 = (T_1 \cap W_1) \cap (T_2 \cap W_1) = 1$. This contradiction shows that $W_1$ is a 2-group.

(6) Final contradiction.

Let $P_1$ be a maximal subgroup of $W_1$. Then $|W_1 : P_1| = 2$. By the hypothesis, there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $K$ of $G$ such that $G = P_1K$ and $P_1 \cap K \leq (P_1)_{\sigma G}$. By (1) and Lemma 2.2 (8), $(P_1)_{\sigma G} = 1$, Hence $|K|_2 = 2$, and so $K$ is 2-nilpotent by [16, IV, Theorem 2.8]. Let $K_{2'}$ be the normal Hall $2'$-subgroup of $K$. Then $1 \neq K_{2'}$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$, and so $K_{2'} \leq O_{\sigma_1'}(G) = 1$ by Lemma 2.2(8). The finial contradiction completes the proof. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** Assume that the assertion is false, and let $G$ be a counterexample of minimal order.

(1) $G$ is soluble.

Let $q$ is the smallest prime dividing $|G|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $q \in \pi(W_1)$. If $W_1$ is cyclic, then the Sylow $q$-subgroup of $G$ is cyclic. Hence $G$ is $q$-nilpotent by [16, IV, Theorem 2.8] and so $G$ is soluble. If $W_1$ is non-cyclic, then by Proposition 4.1, $G$ is soluble. Hence we always have that $G$ is soluble.

(2) The hypothesis holds on $G/R$ for every non-identity minimal normal subgroup $R$ of $G$. Consequently $G/R$ is supersoluble.

It is clear that $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = \{1, W_1R/R, W_2R/R, \cdots, W_tR/R\}$ is a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G/R$ and $W_iR/R \simeq W_i/W_i \cap R$ is nilpotent. By (1), $R$ is an elementary abelian $p$-group for some prime $p$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $R \leq W_1$. If $W_1/R$ is non-cyclic, then $W_1$ is non-cyclic. For every maximal subgroup $M/R$ of $W_1/R$, we have that $M$ is a

maximal subgroup of $W_1$. Then by the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (2), $M/R$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/R$. Now assume that $W_iR/R$ is non-cyclic for $i \neq 1$ and $M/R$ be a maximal subgroup of $W_iR/R$. Then $M = (M \cap W_i)R$. As $W_i$ is nilpotent, $|W_iR/R : M/R| = |W_iR/R : (M \cap W_i)R/R| = |W_i : M \cap W_i|$ is a prime. Hence $M \cap W_i$ is a maximal subgroup of $W_i$. By the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (3), $M/R = (M \cap W_i)R/R$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/R$. This shows that the hypothesis holds for $G/R$. Hence $G/R$ is supersoluble by the choice of $G$.

(3) $R$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$, $\Phi(G) = 1$, $C_G(R) = R = F(G) = O_p(G)$ and $|R| > p$ for some prime $p$ (It follows from (2)).

(4) For some $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, t\}$, $W_i$ is a $p$-group. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $W_1$ is a $p$-group.

Since $R$ is a $p$-group, $R \leq W_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, t\}$. Moreover, since $C_G(R) = R$ and $W_i$ is a nilpotent group, we have that $W_i$ is a $p$-group.

(5) Final contradiction.

Since $\Phi(G) = 1$, $R \not\leq \Phi(W_1)$ [16, Chapter III, Lemma 3.3]. Hence there exists a maximal subgroup $V$ of $W_1$ such that $W_1 = RV$. Let $E = R \cap V$. Then $|R : E| = |RV : V| = |W_1 : V| = p$. Hence $E$ is a maximal subgroup of $R$ and $1 \neq E \trianglelefteq W_1$. Since $|R| > p$ and $R \leq W_1$, $W_1$ is non-cyclic. Hence by the hypothesis, there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = VT$ and $V \cap T \leq V_{\sigma G}$. Since $|G : T|$ is $p$-number, $O^p(T) = O^{\sigma_1}(T) = O^{\sigma_1}(G)$ by Lemma 2.2 (7). So $|G : T_G|$ is $p$-number. It follows that $T_G \neq 1$ and $R \leq T_G \leq T$ by (2). Since $V_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-subnormal in $G$ by Lemma 2.3 (4), we have that $V_{\sigma G} \leq O_{\sigma_1}(G) = O_p(G) = R$ by Lemma 2.2 (8). Hence $E = R \cap V \leq T \cap V \leq V_{\sigma G} \leq R$. But since $E$ is a maximal subgroup of $R$, it follows that $V_{\sigma G} = R$ or $V_{\sigma G} = E$. In the former case, we have that $R \leq V$, a contradiction. In the later case, $E = V_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$ by Lemma 2.3 (4) and $E$ is a $\sigma_1$-group. It follows from Lemma 2.4 that $O^{\sigma_1}(G) \leq N_G(E)$. Hence $E \trianglelefteq G$, which contradicts the minimality of $R$. The final contradiction completes the proof of the theorem.

# 5 Proof of Theorem 1.13

Assume that the assertion is false and let $(G, E)$ be a counterexample with $|G| + |E|$ minimal. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $W_i$ is a $\sigma_i$-group for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, t$. We now proceed with the proof via the following steps.

(1) $E$ is supersoluble.

In fact, $\{1, W_1 \cap E, W_2 \cap E, \cdots, W_t \cap E\}$ is a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $E$ and $W_i \cap E$ is nilpotent. Consequently, $E$ is a $\sigma$-full group of Sylow type. By Lemma 2.5 (1) and Theorem 1.5. Hence $E$ is supersoluble.

(2) If $R$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ contained in $E$, then $R$ is a $p$-group for some prime $p$ and the hypothesis holds for $(G/R, E/R)$. Therefore $E/R \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/R)$.

By (1), $R$ is a $p$-group for some $p$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $R \leq W_1 \cap E$. It is clear that $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = \{1, W_1/R, W_2R/R, \cdots, W_tR/R\}$ is a complete Hall $\sigma$-set of $G/R$ and $W_iR/R \simeq W_i/W_i \cap R$ is nilpotent. Let $M/R$ be a maximal subgroup of $(W_1 \cap E)/R$. Then by the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (2), $M/R$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/R$. Now let $V/R$ be a maximal subgroup of $W_iR/R \cap E/R = (W_i \cap E)R/R$, $i = 2, \cdots, t$. Then $V = (V \cap W_i)R$. Since $W_iR/R \cap E/R$ is nilpotent, $|W_i \cap E : V \cap W_i| = |W_iR \cap E : (V \cap W_i)R| = |W_iR/R \cap E/R : V/R|$ is a prime, so $V \cap W_i$ is a maximal subgroup of $W_i \cap E$. Then by the hypothesis and Lemma 2.5 (3), $V/R = (V \cap W_i)R/R$ is weakly $\sigma$-permutable in $G/R$, $i = 2, \cdots, t$. This shows that $(G/R, E/R)$ satisfies the hypothesis. Thus $E/R \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/R)$ by the choice of $(G, E)$.

(3) $R$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$ contained in $E$, $|R| > p$ and $O_{p'}(E) = 1$.

Let $L$ be a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ contained in $E$ such that $R \neq L$. Then $E/R \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/R)$ and $E/L \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/L)$ by (2), and clearly, $|R| > p$. It follows that $LR/L \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/L)$, so $|R| = p$ by the $G$-isomorphism $RL/L \simeq R$, a contradiction. Hence $R$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of $G$ contained in $E$. Consequently, $O_{p'}(E) = 1$. Hence (3) holds.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $p \in \pi(W_1)$.

(4) $E$ is a $p$-group and so $E \cap W_1 = E$ and $E \cap W_i = 1$ for $i = 2, 3, \cdots, t$.

Let $q$ be the largest prime dividing $|E|$ and let $Q$ be a Sylow $q$-subgroup of $E$. Since $E$ is supersoluble by (1) (see [16, Chapter VI, Theorem 9.1]), $Q$ is characteristic in $E$. Then $Q$ is normal in $G$. Hence by (3) we have that $q = p$ and $F(E) = Q = O_p(E) = P$ is a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $E$. Thus $C_E(P) \leq P$ (see [27, Theorem 1.8.18]). But since $P \leq W_1 \cap E$ and $W_1 \cap E$ is nilpotent, we have that $P = W_1 \cap E$. Since $P \cap W_1 = P = W_1 \cap E$ and $P \cap W_i = 1$ for all $i = 2, \cdots, t$, the hypothesis holds for $(G, P)$. If $P < E$, then $R \leq P \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$ by the choice of $(G, E)$. It follows that $|R| = p$, a contradiction. Hence $E = P$ is a $p$-group, and so $E \leq W_1$.

(5) $\Phi(E) = 1$, so $E$ is elementary abelian $p$-group.

Assume that $\Phi(E) \neq 1$. Then clearly, $(G/\Phi(E), E/\Phi(E))$ satisfies the hypothesis. Hence $E/\Phi(E) \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/\Phi(E))$. It follows from (4) and Lemma 2.6 that $E \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$, a contradiction. Thus we have (5).

(6) Final contradiction.

Let $R_1$ be a maximal subgroup of $R$ such that $R_1 \trianglelefteq W_1$. Then $|R_1| > 1$ by (3). Claim (5) implies that $R$ has a complement $S$ in $E$. Let $V = R_1S$. Then $R \cap V = R_1$ and $V$ is a maximal subgroup of $E$. Hence by (4) and the hypothesis, there exists a $\sigma$-subnormal subgroup $T$ of $G$ such that $G = VT$ and $V \cap T \leq V_{\sigma G}$. Then $G = VT = ET$ and $E = V(E \cap T)$. By (5), it is easy to see that $1 \neq E \cap T \trianglelefteq G$. Hence $R \leq E \cap T$ by (3), and so $R_1 = R \cap V \leq E \cap T \cap V =$

$V \cap T \leq V_{\sigma G}$. Consequently, $R_1 \leq V_{\sigma G} \cap R \leq R$. It follows that $R = V_{\sigma G} \cap R$ or $R_1 = V_{\sigma G} \cap R$. In the former case, $R \leq V$, which contradicts the fact that $R_1 = R \cap V$. Thus $R_1 = V_{\sigma G} \cap R$. By Lemma 2.3(4), we have that $V_{\sigma G}$ is $\sigma$-permutable in $G$, so $O^{\sigma_1}(G) \leq N_G(V_{\sigma G})$ by Lemma 2.4. Hence $O^{\sigma_1}(G) \leq N_G(V_{\sigma G} \cap R) = N_G(R_1)$. Moreover, since $R_1 \trianglelefteq W_1$, we obtain that $R_1 \trianglelefteq G$. This implies that $R_1 = 1$. The final contradiction completes the proof.

# References


[1] A. N. Skiba, On $\sigma$-subnormal and $\sigma$-permutable subgroups of finite groups, J. Algebra, **436** (2015), 1-16.

[2] W. Guo, A. N. Skiba, On $\Pi$-permutable subgroups of finite groups, arXiv: 1606.03197.

[3] Y. Wang, C-Normality of groups and its properties, J. Algebra, **180** (1996), 954-965.

[4] A. N. Skiba, On weakly $s$-permutable subgroups of finite groups, J. Algebra, **315** (2007), 192-209.

[5] M. Assad, Finite groups with certain subgroups of Sylow subgroups compiemented, J. Algebra, **323** (2010), 1958-1965.

[6] A. Ballester-Bolinches, Y.Wang, X.Guo, c-supplemented subgroups of finite groups, Glasg. Math. J, **42** (2000), 383-389.

[7] A. Ballester-Bolinches, R. Esteban-Romero, M. Asaad, *Products of Finite Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2010.

[8] W. Guo, *Structure Theory for Canonical Classes of Finite Groups*, Springer, 2015.

[9] W. Guo, A. N. Skiba, Finite groups with generalized Ore supplement conditions for primary subgroups, J.Algebra, **432** (2015), 205-227.

[10] B. Li, On $\Pi$-property and $\Pi$-normality of subgroups of finite groups, J. Algebra, **334** (2011), 321-337.

[11] H. Wei, On $c$-normal maximal and minimal subgroups of Sylow subgroups of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **29** (2001), 2193C2200.

[12] A. N. Skiba , On $\sigma$-properties of finite groups II, Problems of Physics, Mathematics and Technics, **3**(24) (2015), 70-83.

[13] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1992.

[14] W. Guo, A. N. Skiba, Finite groups with permutable complete Wielandt set of subgroups, J. Group Theory, **18** (2015), 191-200.

[15] S. Srinivasan, Two sufficient conditions for supersolvability of finite groups, Israel J.Math., **35** (1980), 210-214.

[16] B. Huppert, *Endliche Gruppen I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.

[17] L. Miao, On weakly s-permutable subgroups of finite groups, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc., **41** (2) (2010), 223C235.

[18] R. Schmidt, *Subgroups Lattices of Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1994.

[19] M. Weinsten, Between Nilpotent and Soluble, Polygonal Publishing House, Passaic, 1982.

[20] A. N. Skiba, A characterization of the hypercyclically embedded subgroups of finite groups, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **215** (2011), 257-261.

[21] A. N. Skiba, On two questions of L.A. Shemetkov concerning hypercyclically embeded subgroups in finite groups, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **215** (2011), 257-261.

[22] L. A. Shemetkov and A. N. Skiba, On the $\mathfrak{X}\Phi$-hypercentre of finite groups, J. Algebra, **322** (2009), 2106-2117.

[23] W.Guo, Alexander N. Skiba, X. Tang, On Boundary Factors and Traces of Subgroups of Finite Groups, Commum. Math. Stat., **2** (2014), 349-361.

[24] M. Assad, Influence of $S$-quasinormality on maximal subgroups of Sylow subgroups of Fitting subgroup of a finite group, Arch. Math., (Basel) **56** (1991), 521-527.

[25] M. Assad, On maximal subgroups of finite group, Comm. Algebra **26** (1998), 3647C3652.

[26] X. Chen, W. Guo, A. N. Skiba, Some conditions under which a finite group belongs to a Baer-local formation, *Comm. Algebra*, **42** (2014), 4188-4203.

[27] W. Guo, *The Theory of Classes of Groups*, Science Press-Kluwer Academic Publishers, Beijing-New York-Dordrecht-Boston-London, 2000.